UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/473,323	12/28/99	MAINI R	21964-P002US

PM82/0327

ROBERT C SHADDOX
WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK PC
SUITE 2400
910 TRAVIS
HOUSTON TX 77002-5895

EXAMINER	
LAGMAN, F	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3673	3

DATE MAILED: 03/27/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/473,323	Applicant(s) Maini et al
	Examiner Frederick L. Lagman	Group Art Unit 3673

☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) *1-47* is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) *42-47* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) *1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 19, and 20* is/are rejected.

☒ Claim(s) *2, 3, 6, 8, 11, 13, 16, 18, and 21-41* is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐approved ☐disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-41, drawn to a taut mooring system for a jack-up platform, classified in class 405, subclass 224.

II. Claims 42-47, drawn to a method of expanding the safe working area of operation, increasing the maximum water depth limit, increasing the fatigue life, increasing the service life and increasing the severity of the environmental criteria, classified in class 73, subclass 786.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions II and I are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case, the apparatus can be used to production operations.

3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

4. During a telephone conversation with Robert Shaddox on 3/23/01 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-41. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 42-47 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

Drawings

6. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Specification

7. The use of the trademark Kevlar has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawagoe et al #4,735,526. Kawagoe et al discloses a jack-up platform 10 comprising legs 12 raised and lowered by a jacking system; mooring lines 38 radially spaced in plan on extremities of the hull; anchors 39 that are radially spaced and attached to the mooring lines; and tensioning system 37 for providing tension in the mooring lines 38.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 4, 5, 14, 15, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawagoe et al in view of Petty et al #5,061,131.

As to claims 4 and 5, Kawagoe et al discloses the claimed invention except for the single mooring line extending at equal angles or multiple lines extending in sets. Petty et al teaches that it is known to provide multiple lines 18 extending in sets as shown in figure 1. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide multiple lines extending in sets, as taught by Petty et al in order to facilitate stabilization of an offshore rig. Kawagoe et al shows a platform moored adjacent a preinstalled gravity structure; however if Kawagoe et al was not adjacent such structure it would have been obvious matter of design choice to have a single line extending at equal angles from the hull extremities, since doing so would facilitate stabilization of the offshore platform.

As to claims 14 and 15, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a Kevlar cable, since doing so would provide a stronger, durable mooring line.

As to claims 19 and 20, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have mooring lines at an angle within the range of 20-40 degrees, since doing so would depend upon for example water depth, length of mooring line.

12. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawagoe et al in view of Westra et al #4,432,671. Kawagoe et al discloses the claimed invention except for the suction anchor. Westra et al teaches that it is known to provide suction anchors for offshore structures as set forth at column 1, lines 10-14. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a suction anchor, as taught by Westra et al in order to facilitate anchoring of an offshore structure.

13. Claims 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawagoe et al alone.

As to claim 12, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a Kevlar cable, since doing so would provide a stronger, durable mooring line.

As to claim 17, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have mooring lines at an angle within the range of 20-40 degrees, since doing so would depend upon for example water depth, length of mooring line.

14. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawagoe et al in view of Petty et al as applied to claims 4 and 5 above, and further in view of Westra et al. Kawagoe et al as modified by Petty et al discloses the claimed invention except for the suction anchor. Westra et al teaches that it is known to provide suction anchors for offshore structures as set forth at column 1, lines 10-14. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to provide a suction anchor, as taught by Westra et al in order to facilitate anchoring of an offshore structure.

Allowable Subject Matter

15. Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 11, 13, 16, 18, and 21-41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frederick L. Lagman whose telephone number is (703) 305-7456.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. David Bagnell, can be reached at (703) 308-2151. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-7687.

DAVID BAGNELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

FLL

March 23, 2001